

## **Remarks**

### **1. Summary of the Office Action**

In the Office Action mailed September 19, 2007, (i) the Examiner rejected claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the method of claim 2” since claim 2 is no longer pending, and (ii) the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16, 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31, and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by “Sprint PCS J2ME Application Environment,” an article by Scott Papineau, (hereinafter “Papineau”).

Additionally, the Office Action Summary sheet of the Office Action has box 10 checked, but box a or b is not checked to indicate whether the drawings filed on March 23, 2004 are accepted or objected to by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an indication whether the drawings are accepted or objected to.

### **2. Amendments and Pending Claims**

Applicant has amended claim 1, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 19-22, 28, 38, 39, and 41, cancelled claims 3-5, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 42, and added new claims 44-56. Claims 1, 6, 9-14, 19-22, 28, 38-41, and 43-56 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 14, and 28 are independent.

### **3. Response to Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the term “the method of claim 2.” Applicant has amended claim 38 to recite “the method of claim 1” instead of the “the method of claim 2.” Applicant submits that this amendment overcomes the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second

paragraph, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of claim 38.

#### **4. Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16, 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31, and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Papineau. Of these claims, 3-5, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 42 have been cancelled. Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 3-5, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 42 is now moot. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3-5, 16, 23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 31, and 42.

Of the pending claims, 1, 14, and 28 are independent. Under M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Amended independent claims 1, 14, and 28 clearly distinguish over Papineau, because Papineau does not disclose or suggest each and every element as recited in any of these claims.

##### **a. Claim 1**

With respect to amended independent claim 1, at a minimum, Papineau does not teach or suggest: (i) at an application management system, appending data to a URI that identifies a first Java MIDlet application, and (ii) passing the appended data and the URI that identifies the first Java MIDlet application from the application management system to a second Java MIDlet application on the mobile information device.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner stated “that Papineau teaches ‘appending the second input data to the first input data’ as ‘Class that allows a MIDlet to receive input parameters and data upon invocation’ (Page 29) and ‘On startup, the Muglet calls Muglet.getMuglet() to determine if there is input data to be processed’ (Page 32).” (Office Action, page 3).

Although these sections of Papineau cited by the Examiner teach that a *MIDlet can receive* input parameters and data upon invocation, Applicant submits that these sections of Papineau, alone or in combination with the other sections of Papineau, do not teach or suggest that an *application management system appends* data received from a Java MIDlet application to a URI that identifies the Java MIDlet application.

Thus, even if it is assumed that the input parameters disclosed by Papineau amount to the claimed “URI that identifies a first Java MIDlet application” and that the “data” disclosed by Papineau amount to the claimed “data,” Applicant submits that Papineau does not teach or suggest (i) *at an application management system, appending data to a URI* that identifies a first Java MIDlet application, and (ii) *passing the appended data and the URI* that identifies the Java MIDlet application from an application management system to a second Java MIDlet application on a mobile information device, as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added).

**b. Claim 14**

With respect to amended independent claim 14, at a minimum, Papineau does not teach or suggest: (i) at an application management system, appending data to a URI that identifies a first Java MIDlet application, and (ii) passing the appended data and the URI that identifies the Java MIDlet application from an application management system to a *non-MIDlet application* on a mobile information device. (Emphasis added).

In rejecting claim 14, the Examiner stated “that Papineau teaches ‘appending the second input data to the first input data’ as ‘Class that allows a MIDlet to receive input parameters and data upon invocation’ (Page 29) and ‘On startup, the Muglet calls Muglet.getMuglet() to determine if there is input data to be processed’ (Page 32).” (Office Action, page 9).

First, although these sections of Papineau cited by the Examiner teach that a *MIDlet can receive* input parameters and data upon invocation, Applicant submits that these sections of Papineau, alone or in combination with the other sections of Papineau, do not teach or suggest that an *application management system appends* data received from the MIDlet to a URI that identifies the Java MIDlet application. (Emphasis added).

Thus, even if it is assumed that the input parameters disclosed by Papineau amount to the claimed “URI that identifies a first Java MIDlet application” and that the “data” disclosed by Papineau amount to the claimed “data,” Applicant submits that Papineau does not teach or suggest (i) *at an application management system, appending data to a URI* that identifies a first Java MIDlet application, and (ii) *passing the appended data and the URI* that identifies the Java MIDlet application from an application management system to a non-MIDlet application on a mobile information device. (Emphasis added).

Second, even if it is assumed arguendo that Papineau’s disclosure of the input parameters and data received by the MIDlet amounts to the claimed “appended data and the URI that identifies the Java MIDlet application,” Applicant submits that Papineau merely discloses that the input parameters and data are received by a *MIDlet* upon invocation. (Emphasis added). However, Papineau does not teach or suggest passing the appended data and the URI that identifies the Java MIDlet application from an application management system to a *non-MIDlet application* on a mobile information device, as recited in claim 14. (Emphasis added).

#### c. Claim 28

With respect to amended independent claim 28, at a minimum, Papineau does not teach or suggest: (i) at an application management system, appending data to a URI that identifies a

*non-MIDlet application*, and (ii) passing the appended data and the URI that identifies the *non-MIDlet application* from the application management system to a MIDlet application.

At best, Papineau teaches (i) a class that allows a MIDlet to receive input parameters and data upon invocation, (ii) an application management system can pass context into a MIDlet using a Muglet class, and (iii) the application management system can process context passed out from a MIDlet using an “Exit URI” in a system class. (See, e.g., Papineau, page 28).

First, although these sections of Papineau teach that a *MIDlet can receive* input parameters and data upon invocation, Applicant submits that these sections of Papineau, alone or in combination with the other sections of Papineau, do not teach or suggest that *an application management system appends* data received from the Java MIDlet to a URI that identifies a Java MIDlet application.

Thus, even if it is assumed that the input parameters disclosed by Papineau amount to the claimed “URI that identifies a first Java MIDlet application” and that the “data” disclosed by Papineau amount to the claimed “data,” Applicant submits that Papineau does not teach or suggest (i) *at an application management system, appending data to a URI* that identifies a non-MIDlet application, and (ii) *passing the appended data and the URI* that identifies the non-MIDlet application from an application management system to a MIDlet application on a mobile information device.

Second, even if it is assumed arguendo that Papineau’s disclosure of the input parameters and data received by the MIDlet amounts to the claimed “appended second data and the URI that identifies the non-MIDlet application,” Applicant submits that Papineau merely discloses that the input parameters and data are received by a *MIDlet* upon invocation and the *application management system* can process context passed out from a *MIDlet*. (Emphasis added).

However, Papineau does not teach or suggest *at the application management system, receiving the first data from a non-MIDlet application* and receiving the second data from the *non-MIDlet application*, as recited in claim 28. (Emphasis added).

Applicant submits that claims 1, 14, and 28 are allowable because Papineau fails to disclose or suggest the combination of limitations recited in any of claims 1, 14, and 28. Further, without conceding the assertions made by the Examiner regarding rejected dependent claims 6, 9-13, 19-22, 26, 38-41 and 43, Applicant submits that dependent claims 6, 9-13, 19-22, 26, 38-41 and 43 are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from one of allowable claims 1, 14, and 28.

## 5. New Claims

Applicant submits that new claims 44-56 are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from one of allowable claims 1, 14, and 28.

## 6. Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this response. However, failure to address a specific rejection or assertion made by the Examiner does not signify that Applicant agrees with or concedes that rejection or assertion.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 6, 9-14, 19-22, 28, 38-41, and 43-56 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: October 30, 2007

By: /David L. Ciesielski/  
David L. Ciesielski  
Reg. No. 57,432